

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

Daniel McGough,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 24-cv-12820

v.

Judith E. Levy

United States District Judge

Victoria I. Shackelford, *et al.*,

Mag. Judge Anthony P. Patti

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER DISMISSING CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

On October 22, 2024, Plaintiff Daniel McGough initiated this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the following Defendants: 23rd District Court Judge Victoria I. Shackelford; Taylor Police Department Detective Mark Johnston; and Taylor Police Department Officers Katlyn Bartaway, Edward Moore, Larry Frederick, and Lamar Frederick. On November 5, 2024, the Court issued an order striking the complaint filed by Plaintiff because “[t]he complaint [wa]s not signed by Plaintiff, who is self-represented.” (ECF No. 5, PageID.11 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a)).) The Court’s order stated that “[b]y **November 18, 2024**, Plaintiff must file an amended complaint that contains his handwritten signature.” (*Id.*

(emphasis in original).) Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint by that date. As a result, the Court issued a show cause order on April 7, 2025. (ECF No. 10.) The Court's order contained the following language:

Plaintiff is ordered to show cause in writing why the Court should not dismiss the action for failure to comply with the Court's [November 5, 2024] order. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). Plaintiff's response to this show cause order is due by **April 18, 2025. Failure to file a response by April 18, 2025 will result in sanctions, including the dismissal of the action.**

(*Id.* at PageID.24 (emphasis in original).)

The deadline for Plaintiff to respond to the Court's April 7, 2025 show cause order has elapsed, and the Court has not received any communication from Plaintiff. Plaintiff has not responded to the show cause order. Nor has he submitted an amended complaint or asked for more time to file a response or an amended complaint. The Court previously warned Plaintiff about the possibility of dismissal if he failed to respond within the specified time frame. (*See id.*) In light of Plaintiff's non-compliance with the Court's orders—as well as the current posture of the case—the Court finds it appropriate to dismiss the case without prejudice. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Mich. LR 41.2; *Bay Corrugated Container, Inc. v. Gould, Inc.*, 609 F. App'x 832, 835 (6th Cir. 2015).

Accordingly, the case is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2025  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

s/Judith E. Levy  
JUDITH E. LEVY  
United States District Judge

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or first-class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on May 6, 2025.

s/William Barkholz  
WILLIAM BARKHOLZ  
Case Manager